

ORGANIZATION CRITERIA

Organization Profile		
Organization General		
Proposed program and service(s) corresponds with the mission, goals, and strategic plan	Yes	No
History of providing proposed program service(s) or similar service(s)	Yes	No
Sufficient number of qualified, independent governing board members	Yes	No
Majority of governing board members are residents of Columbia	Yes	No
Employee compensation levels are reasonable	Yes	No
Organization Financial		
No significant issues identified in financial statement	Yes	No
Sufficient financial procedures, which include board oversight	Yes	No
Sufficient level of other sources of funding	Yes	No
Appropriate ratio of management and fundraising expenses to program expenses	Yes	No
Sufficient level of reserve funds	Yes	No

Score

Yes	1
No	0

PROGRAM CRITERIA

Program Overview form				
Statement of the Issue Being Addressed				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevancy of issue to be addressed to the issue identified in RFP • Use of data to describe the issue • Use of data to describe the population affected by the issue • Use of data to describe the effect of the issue on Columbia, MO • Use of data to describe the community-level equity issues 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Program Goal and Overview				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance of stated goal(s) to organization's mission and goal(s), the issue(s) to be addressed, and program consumers. • Description of the program • Relevance of the program and program service(s) to the issue identified in the RFP • Stated impact of the program on advancing equity in Columbia, MO 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Program Access				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program location and hours of service • Relevance of consumer eligibility criteria to target population of program and RFP • Program cost to consumer 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Program Consumers				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of data to describe the program consumers • Rationale for the target program consumers • Relevance of target population to RFP • Total number of individuals to be served • Total cost per individual served • Consumer demographics reflection of the target population 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Program Quality				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with applicable external requirements • Use of available best practices and/or standards • Strength of evidence to support the proposed program service(s) • Utilization and strength of quality improvement process • Utilization of consumer feedback in quality improvement process 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Program Partnerships and Collaborations				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of partnerships intended to advance community-level solutions for the issue(s) the proposed program is intended to address, as indicated in the response to the Statement of the Issue Being Addressed • Level of partnerships intended to enhance program access and/or quality 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor

Citations				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adherence to required citation methodology • Appropriateness of sources • Relevance, quality, and quantity of citations 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor

Program Personnel and Budget form				
Program Personnel				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program personnel qualifications • Program staffing levels • Program personnel compensation levels 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Program Budget				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of detail in budget narrative • Adequacy of overall program funding • Ratio of City of Columbia funding to other sources of funding • Correlation between program expenses and program description/services/performance measures 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor

Program Outcomes and Services form				
Program Outcomes				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship of outcome(s) to program goal(s) and issue identified in RFP • Relativity and feasibility of outcome indicator(s) • Relativity, validity, and reliability of the method(s) of measurement • Relationship of program services to outcomes 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Program Service(s) Outputs				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of units of service to be provided • Number of individuals to be served • Average units of service per individual 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Program Service(s) Cost				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit of service rate • Average cost per individual • Program service fee rationale 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
Funding Request Justification				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilization of other local funding and third-party payer sources • Justification for level of funding requested from the City of Columbia • Basis for funding request from the City of Columbia 				
Rating:	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor

4-Excellent	Exceptionally well-conceived and thoroughly developed response to the given question. Content resonates deeply with the expectations and impact goals of the RFP.
3-Good	Response is largely relevant, sufficient, and appropriate to address the criterion, although some minor inconsistencies or weaknesses may remain.
2-Fair	Response pertains in some intelligible and useful way to the stated criterion, but otherwise is significantly unclear, inaccurate, incomplete, inconsistent, or irrelevant.
1-Poor	Does not meet minimal standards. Response is prohibitively unclear, inaccurate, incomplete, inconsistent, irrelevant to the stated criterion, or otherwise exhibits a clear conflict with the goals of the RFP.